THEOLOGY

VOL. LV OCTOBER, 1952 No. 388

Editorial

IN October 1939 Professor Karl Barth's son Markus, who had just spent a year studying theology at Edinburgh, contributed an article to *The Congregational Quarterly*, entitled "P. T. Forsyth: the theologian for the practical man". He expressed his astonishment that Forsyth's works were not far more widely read in Britain; and he said that Forsyth's theological teaching would be a much more apt corrective of British semi-pelagianism than "a repristination of Augustinianism, historic Calvinism, or reformed Orthodoxy". This was an interesting suggestion and, as it has turned out, in a measure prophetic. For since then the rediscovery of Forsyth has been steadily proceeding, and in recent years his major works have been republished, as our book reviews have witnessed.

But only now has a substantial study of Forsyth, the man and his work, appeared.[1] It is by an American scholar, Dr W. L. Bradley, and is to be highly commended for its thoroughness, its understanding, and its restraint. Rediscoverers, like discoverers, are always prone to claim too much for what they have found. Before giving a methodical and well-documented account of Forsyth's teaching under its chief heads—"The Holiness of God and the Sinfulness of Man", "The Need for Atonement", "The Doctrine of Christ", and "The Church"—Dr Bradley tells the story of Forsyth's life, more fully than has been done heretofore; and he also examines the somewhat elusive questions of the sources of Forsyth's characteristic ideas and of the development of his thought.

What the ordinary theological reader, who has not hitherto read Forsyth, wants to know is whether it is important that he should do so. And this is not an easy question to answer. J. K. Mozley, who did not use language recklessly, said that Forsyth was perhaps Britain's greatest theologian in the sphere of dogmatics. "During the last fifteen years [Mozley was writing in 1922 shortly after Forsyth's death] he had come more and more to be recognized as occupying a position of almost solitary eminence." Dr Bradley, in his concluding chapter, cites this and many other estimates of Forsyth's work, some of which rank it almost as highly, while others are more or less dubious.

There is no doubt that Forsyth is a theologian who was in advance of his time, in the sense that during the first twenty years of this century he was saying things which now seem quite familiar, but which hardly anyone else was saying then. Terms like *kerygma*, crisis, etc.,

[1] *P. T. Forsyth: the man and his work*, by W. L. Bradley, Independent Press, 18s. 6d.

were prominent in his teaching. He used to refer to Kierkegaard before other theologians had heard of him. In 1910 and thereabouts he was hammering away at "the themes of Redemption, Justification, and Conversion", which in 1938 Archbishop Temple spoke of as the themes for Anglican pioneers.[1] Forsyth—like F. D. Maurice, whom in many respects he resembled and by whom he was at first much influenced—proclaimed always a corporate and cosmic, never a merely individual or sectional, redemption. He was a high churchman when, in nonconformity at any rate, high churchmanship was out of fashion. He spoke of revelation when others were speaking of experience, and of authority when others were speaking of liberty, and of theology when others were speaking of religion. At the same time, he realized clearly and insisted continually that orthodoxy must come to terms with the new insights and discoveries which the unsatisfactory word "Liberalism" is used to designate. He felt the full force and depth of this crisis and knew there was no easy way out of it. *Abyssus abyssum invocat, in voce cataractarum tuarum. Omnia excelsa tua, et fluctus tui super me transierunt* (Ps. 42. 7).

It does not follow that it is indispensable to read Forsyth to-day, for there are now many other divines, British as well as foreign, who are exponents of the same message. His books—with the exception possibly of *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*—are not likely to become theological classics, because they do not deal in a sufficiently methodical manner with any one subject, and because his literary style is never likely to win a consensus of approval. This is not to say that his style suffers from the dullness or heaviness which is the mark of too much theological writing: on the contrary, it is for most tastes too epigrammatic, rhetorical, grandiloquent. His use of words is certainly extraordinary: sometimes he is able by a striking turn of phrase to startle the reader into sudden and unforgettable insight; but at other times one could do with a little more lucidity and a little less of the bizarre. Still, time is never wasted in trying to think out what Forsyth really did mean, for the great questions were always pressing upon his mind.

Dr Bradley quotes freely and his comments are nearly always[2] perceptive. He makes it possible for anyone to see what it is that Forsyth has to give, and why some are moved to read everything he wrote while others will always be allergic to his manner of presenting theological truth.

St Mark's Gospel

THE most notable feature of recent Marcan criticism has been its break with the earlier notion that Mark was essentially a simple composition. Its simplicity, it used to be thought, was instanced by

[1] *Doctrine in the Church of England*, p. 17.

[2] Not invariably. For instance, it is, so far as Britain is concerned, wide of the mark to say that "after Forsyth's death the errors of Campbell and his school (i.e. the 'New Theology') were accepted generally by Christians in America and Britain" (p. 62).

its general plan of construction, which emphasizes significant turning-points in Jesus' life and plots a straightforward tale in which one major incident is intelligibly and significantly related to the others.[1] Enthusiasts for Mark like Wellhausen, Burkitt, Turner, and Lake, were prepared to admit the episodic character of the narrative within the main divisions of the story and to agree with Papias that the chronological order, especially in the accounts of the Galilean ministry, could not always be pressed. Some detached incidents gave the impression of having been tucked unskilfully into the narrative instead of woven firmly into its texture.[2] Not all the episodes related seemed equally credible or equally primitive[3] and some appeared to be doublets.[4] The style was considered rugged and rustic and the language penetrated by Semitic influence, owing perhaps to direct translation from Aramaic or more probably to its author's bilingual mentality.[5] No one denied that some of the material found in Mark had been related orally in Aramaic and probably in Greek before Mark wrote it down, but most critics agreed that the style of Mark, however far removed from pure classical Greek or from the pedantry of Asianic rhetoric, was distinctive and personal, the natural vehicle of his own literary personality.[6]

Against this background of sober critical judgment must be placed the divergences from it which date roughly from 1918. The first has aimed at dissecting Mark into its component parts, small units of narrative or teaching, each having a special point or function. These, it is maintained, derived ultimately from a fluid oral tradition which had a motivation of its own and did not always reach Mark in the same form in which they reached Matthew and Luke. Some differences between the Synoptic Gospels are hence to be explained, not by the proved literary dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark and by the editorial procedures of the former, but by earlier variations in the oral tradition which intrude upon the text of the Gospels, carry their own weight, and impose their own logic. The contribution of the evangelists to their own works was to compile and edit the small units which they took over.

One section of Mark lends itself less readily to this kind of analysis into bits and pieces than the rest: the account of Jesus' Passion. Here the episodic character of the account of the Galilean ministry is replaced by a consecutive story of the events at Jerusalem, which occupies nearly a third of the whole Gospel. The form critics believe that this had a special origin and history, due to its peculiar interest.

---

[1] The simplest and clearest statement of this case has been made by F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus*, 2nd ed., London, 1922.

[2] Cf. Mark 11. 12–14; 20–26.

[3] Cf. Mark 6. 45; 13. 32; 14. 62.

[4] Cf. Mark 4. 35; 6. 45.

[5] J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*, 2th Aufl. 1909; *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 2th Aufl. 1911. The later literature stemming mainly from C. C. Torrey's studies is very large. Competent and sensible estimates of the evidence are to be found in Père Lagrange's and in Vincent Taylor's commentaries.

[6] This view was greatly strengthened by Turner's masterly articles on Marcan usage in *J.T.S.*, XXV–XXIX.

Attempts have been made to break down the Passion narratives in the Gospels into two or more sources, but the idea of *a* Passion narrative, distinct from other records of Jesus' life, has remained a fixed dogma of the school. The difference between the Passion narrative and the smaller units is, however, less than might at first appear. Both on this theory were designed to edify and instruct, both subserved Christian apologetic. No early Christian was interested in the events of Jesus' life or death for their own sake or because they concerned Jesus, but only because they elucidated the process of redemption by which Christians were saved or provided a *mise en scène* for the teaching of Jesus by which they were to live. From the beginning both the small units and the Passion Narrative(s) subserved a catechetical or liturgical aim or both, since no sharp line between catechesis and liturgy could legitimately be drawn at so early a period.[1]

The second line of recent Marcan criticism is the discovery of an extremely intricate underlying theological pattern.[2] It might be thought that this was inconsistent with the view that the Gospel could be dissected into primitive units so that the total work was a mere compilation, but in fact the new theories depend on the dissection into such units before the subtlety of their assembly can be perceived. It is not always clear whether the subtlety claimed for the underlying pattern derives from the mind of Mark as author or from the mind of the Holy Spirit who guided and controlled Mark's mind into pre-figurations of which he was only partly the conscious vehicle.[3] Connexions, however, which are not, strictly speaking, literary, but mystical or symbolic, are suggested and substantiated by a novel and eccentric use of philological or literary materials. These connexions reveal the meaningful substance of Mark's Gospel. The surface is unrevealing to eyes that see not and ears that hear not.

The three books considered in this article[4] are characteristic of recent currents in Marcan criticism. On many points they differ widely, but they share presuppositions which make them typical products of N.T. scholarship in the last thirty years. It is impossible here to deal with all the questions that they raise, but we may consider some of the major issues which they pose as well as some of the particular contributions made by each book to the study of Mark's Gospel.

Archbishop Carrington's book stands closely in line with "form criticism" and is the least concerned with the basic unity of Mark. He starts with the premise that Mark is a compilation of originally

[1] The most conservative of the German "form-critics" has been Dibelius, the most radical Bultmann. A comprehensive description of the method is given by E. Fascher, *Die formgeschichtliche Methode*, Giessen, 1924. In English the works of C. H. Dodd, Vincent Taylor, B. S. Easton, and F. C. Grant, are illuminating.

[2] In this connexion the works of Lightfoot, Farrer, and Carrington, should be mentioned.

[3] This is notably true of Farrer's book considered below.

[4] Philip Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar*, Vol. I (Cambridge University Press, 30s.); Austin Farrer, *A Study in St Mark* (Dacre Press, 25s.); Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (Macmillan, 50s.).

independent units, draws the familiar distinction between the Passion narrative and the other sections, and maintains that the Gospel as we have it represents one stage in the formation of an early Christian lectionary. It was, however, not the first stage. Mark as we have it was based on a proto-Mark (1 Mark), which contained both the early sections and the Passion narrative, but was geared to the old Hebrew calendar of agricultural festivals.[1] This text, now lost, was revised at Rome to suit the Julian calendar in use there, and this revised lectionary is our Mark.[2] The inner logic of Mark's composition is therefore not literary, historical, or theological, but calendrical, and the arrangement of the material was determined neither by the events recorded nor by any development of ideas, but by the order of feasts and fasts prescribed by liturgical usage to which the sections, which are really lections, have been conformed at two points, Galilee and Rome.

Meanwhile another lectionary had been drawn up in Syria or Palestine, proto-Matthew. This document is the one described by Papias and "was a gospel very much like Mark's",[3] and "must have existed in Syria before Mark arrived".[4] It was translated into Greek and was combined with Mark, which had been brought back in its revised form from Rome, and with Q. This new and greatly expanded lectionary is our Gospel of Matthew. Carrington writes, "It is generally agreed that what led to the composition of Matthew was the arrival from Rome of Mark. Though Matthew became the liturgical gospel of Antioch, and reigned alone in that church till the time of Ignatius or later, it does not follow that it was written there. Many scholars think that South Syria is more likely; Tyre or Sidon or even Galilee."[5]

At this stage and later, until the middle of the second century, each Christian community had one lectionary, i.e. what we should call a single gospel, and their calendrical development can be pursued further. The Fourth Gospel took a line of its own and "is built up on a system of three Passovers . . . separated by an unnamed feast in chapter 5, which must be Tabernacles, and an elaborate section based on Tabernacles in chapters 7 and 8 in which Jesus seems to make his final appeal; for at the feast of the Dedication in 10. 22 he is walking in Solomon's Porch, and at the final Passover it is not said that he entered the Temple".[6] Traces of the use of the Jewish calendar may be found in the Epistles. "1 Corinthians is a Paschal letter . . . and 2 Corinthians, or part of it, is a Pentecostal letter."[7] Romans should perhaps (following Manson) be assigned to the Day of Atonement,[8] and "it would be natural to ask whether" the Epistle to the Hebrews "is not a Megillah (or roll) for the Day of Atone-

[1] P. 80. It is worth noting that the Hebrew lectionary in use in Palestine in the first century was based not on an annual but a triennial cycle. The annual cycle was "prevalent in Babylon and later on adopted all over the Diaspora." J. Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*. Cincinnati, 1940, p. 5.

[2] P. 78.

[3] P. 60.

[4] Idem. Cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origin of the Gospel according to St Matthew*, Oxford, 1946, p. 78.

[5] Idem. Cf. Kilpatrick, pp. 133–4.

[6] P. 44.

[7] P. 42.

[8] P. 43.

ment, the ritual of which it interprets in a Christian sense".[1] The Diatessaron of Tatian "is not merely a lectionary" but a calendar as well, in which the ecclesiastical New Year begins in the spring equinox, 25 March.[2] Carrington also advances a novel theory of Marcion's gospel: it was based on an abbreviated edition of Luke, already known to Cerdo, which had been cut down to agree with the Marcan lections found in Codex Vaticanus (see below), "the style being assimilated to Mark at some points, and a Marcan title given to the new document".[3] Other variants of the Marcan lectionary-gospel were adopted by "the early Alexandrian Gnosticism".[4] Though Valentinus and Basilides operated with different calendars. For Valentinus, as for Tatian, the New Year began in the spring, the Paschal season;[5] Basilides, on the other hand, followed the Roman calendar, which began the New Year in January.

In Carrington's opinion the liturgical setting of his proto-Mark goes back to Jesus' own utilization of the Jewish festivals in Galilee as occasions for his preaching and the continued use of them for proclaiming the Christian message by the apostles and their successors. By degrees a standard convention was established by which certain seasons were associated with particular stories about Jesus and his teaching. Once the pattern was set by proto-Mark and proto-Matthew the later development which issued in our Gospels and their dependents followed naturally. Carrington believes he has found subsidiary evidence for this evolution in the earliest systems of chapter divisions in Gospel MSS. There are two ancient systems of chapter divisions, one of which is found in B ℵ 579,[6] the other in A and a host of later witnesses. The date of neither system is known, but ℵ B are commonly assigned to the early fourth century, A to the early fifth. The system in A divides Mark into forty-eight sections preceded by a preface; that in B has sixty-two sections. On the basis of a literary analysis of Mark, which cannot be discussed in detail here, Carrington divides the earlier portion of Mark into forty-eight lections, leaving the Passion narrative as the forty-ninth section, the break coming at the beginning of Mark 13. Following the numeration in A *et al.*, he subdivides the Passion narrative into fourteen

[1] P. 44. [2] P. 29. [3] P. 48.

[4] This is Carrington's phrase for an hypothetical form of Gnosticism which he fancies was current in Alexandria and from which the theologies of Cerinthus, the "Gnostics" (i.e. Ophites), Valentus, and Basilides, were all derived. There is nothing in the sources to commend this view.

[5] P. 56. The argument for this is an interpretation of the Valentian myth, which is hardly Valentinian.

[6] F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction*, 3rd ed., 1883, p. 54; A. Schmidtke, *Die Evangelien eines alten Uncialcodex*, Leipzig, 1903; H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I. 1, Berlin, 1902, p. 402. In view of the importance he attaches to the chapters and what he calls the "script-divisions" (p. 33), a common device in early manuscripts, Carrington has paid curiously little attention to the literature on the subject. He does not mention von Soden's discussion and observes that he owes to Mr T. C. Skeat the reference to Schmidtke which he has apparently not pursued. He makes, for example, the erroneous statement that Sinaiticus shows "no sign of chapter-divisions" (p. 23). Cf. Schmidtke, p. xxvii.

additional lections, which enables him to incorporate both systems into his theory.

No one will deny the fascination of this conception of Gospel origins nor the appeal of its interlocking Christian tradition with devotional practice. Difficulties begin to arise when embarrassing questions are asked about the type or types of liturgy envisaged to require lectionaries such as Mark, Matthew, and John, and about the evidence for the lectionaries themselves.

The assumption that the Christian year and its lectionary derived from the Hebrew calendar is wholly improbable.[1] No doubt Jesus and his disciples celebrated the Jewish feasts, though not the fasts (Mark 2. 18), and the community at Jerusalem was made up largely of observing Jews, at least at first. Even they, however, evolved Christian forms of worship quite independent of the Temple and synagogue. It is extremely unlikely that Gentile converts were won to a special devotion to the Jewish calendar or that their liturgy, whatever it may have been in its earliest stages, was influenced by Jewish practice. Christian worship was the most distinctive Christian achievement and owed much less to its Jewish or pagan antecedents than either Christian ethics or theology. The names of the Jewish months must have been unfamiliar to most Gentile Christians outside Palestine, and the religious associations of the New Year, the Spring Sowing, Midsummer, Tabernacles, and the Passover, must have been quite beyond their range. Only as Christians worshipped in the synagogues could they have been familiar with its liturgical cycle. There is no evidence that the specifically Christian forms of worship (cf. Acts *passim* and 1 Cor. 11–12) followed any such pattern, and Col. 2. 13 is clear evidence that the confusion of Christian with Jewish devotions was deprecated in the Gentile church and encouraged only by subversive Jewish elements.

Carrington's notion that the early Christian communities operated with single Gospels which served as local lectionaries is equally improbable. He assumes without argument that Mark is of Roman origin, though the early evidence is inconclusive and modern critical opinion by no means unanimous. To interpret Papias's Elder, who said that Mark recorded accurately what he remembered but "not in sequence", as referring to a sequence of lections, is to import a wholly foreign element into Papias's context.[2] The evidence of Ignatius's letters does not indicate that Matthew was an Antiochene lectionary or that as a gospel it held the field alone there.[3]

In dealing with the Diatessaron it would have been advisable if Carrington had familiarized himself with the intricacies of the textual problem. In treating it as a lectionary he expects his readers to

[1] The harmonistic lections which are found in later lectionaries: Armenian, Arabic, Syriac, Old Turkish, etc., are derivatives of the Syriac Diatessaron. This has even been maintained of the Latin. C. Peters, *Das Diatessaron Tatians* (Orientalia christiana anelecta 123), Rome, 1939. *passim*.

[2] P. 58. Eusebius, *H.E.*, III. 39, 15.

[3] P. 45. Cf. Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 134. Kilpatrick's case for a liturgical structure in Matthew's composition (p. 72) is more solid.

follow him in accepting as original the chapter divisions of the eleventh-century Arabic version,[1] which may or may not go back to its seventh-century Syriac archetype;[2] and are not those found in the Codex Fuldensis?[3] The Diatessaron was used liturgically in Syria in the fifth century and its use suppressed in the dioceses of Kyrrhos and Edessa by their bishops, Theodoret[4] and Rabbula.[5] It is certain that in Edessa and probably in Kyrrhos[6] the Syriac, not the Greek, Diatessaron was in question. There is no sign of section divisions in the Greek fragment from Doura.[7] Its left-hand margin is destroyed, but the right-hand margin shows no shortened lines as in ℵ B A D, etc. We have therefore no clue to what the divisions of the Greek Diatessaron may have been, if indeed there were any. There is no reason, external or internal, to suppose that Tatian originally designed his work for liturgical use, and in any case it presupposes familiarity with the four canonical Gospels from which it was almost exclusively compiled. This harmonistic treatment of the canonical texts began earlier than 1 *Clement*. The Biblical text of 1 *Clem.* 13. 2 and 46. 8 is derived from a harmony based on Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the Unknown Gospel (early second century), published by Bell and Skeat, is little more than a mosaic of our Gospels, with some apocryphal additions.[8] To say that the Diatessaron was "a belated effort to save the principle underlying the one-gospel system"[9] is a travesty of the known facts.

Another hazardous assumption is that the Marcan chapter divisions found in B *et al.* are older than those in A *et al.* This is far from certain, and von Soden, whose discussion Carrington ignores, has plausibly argued that the B-system is later, representing a division of sense rather than a harmonistic device.[10] There is no reason to believe that either system was earlier than the latter part of the third century or, with the possible exception of the Passion and Resurrection stories, had anything to do with liturgical usage.

So far we have dealt with Carrington's theory of Mark as an early lectionary. He has, however, a second theory of its composition which would appear to contradict the first, but which is presented side by side with it. It appears to have originated from a study of the seed Parables which impressed Carrington with what he calls Mark's "triadic structure".[11] The first triad he observed was that of the three mountains. The first mountain is the one on which the disciples were chosen (Mark 3. 13). The second mountain is un-

[1] Cf. J. Hamlyn Hill, *The Earliest Life of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1893, p. 5.
[2] Peters, p. 27. [3] Carrington, p. 102; Peters, p. 134. [4] *Ep.* 113.
[5] F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, II, pp. 161, 177.
[6] P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds de l'hagiographie byzantine* (Subsidia Hagiographica 26), Bruxelles, 1950, p. 91.
[7] C. H. Kraeling, *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura* (Studies and Documents III), London, 1935. Facsimile.
[8] H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*, London, 1935. [9] P. 31.
[10] Op. cit., I. 1, p. 432. Von Soden allows for the possibility of a liturgical division of the narratives of the Passion and Resurrection, p. 426. The larger chapter divisions have been attributed to Tatian, but could hardly have been adapted to the Diatessaron. [11] Pp. 6, 90 and the Notes *passim*.

happily missing from Mark, though Carrington fails to note this interesting omission and supplies it in the story of the feeding of the five thousand from John 6. 3. The third mountain is the mount of the Transfiguration. From this triad "the view which forces itself on the mind is that the death and resurrection of the Son of Man is announced in parables after the events of the First Mountain, enacted sacramentally at the Second Mountain, and revealed 'openly' at the Third Mountain".[1] Carrington thinks that triads like this constantly recur in Mark, but are occasionally supplemented by pentads and heptads. They are included in some lections, but sometimes cut across them. Their study "will soon convince the student that it is impossible to classify Mark as 'an artless' and simple composition, put together by a person of no literary skill . . . the book as a whole is as carefully designed, balanced, and interlaced as the *Divine Comedy* itself, though its scale is of course much smaller; and yet the creation of so intricate a work of art of such enormous spiritual significance on so small a peak is itself no slight achievement. We are bound to regard this author as a master of the peculiar kind of mystical composition which appealed to him and to his auditors. . . ."[2] We shall hear more of this kind of mystical composition and the numerical intricacies in which it is involved from Dr Farrer. It is, however, difficult to see at what point it enters the Marcan picture: in the oral tradition? in proto-Mark? or in Roman Mark? A lectionary which is bound strictly to calendrical observance and yet which is "as carefully designed, balanced, and interlaced as the *Divine Comedy*" would indeed be "no slight achievement".

The studies of Carrington and Farrer are apparently not wholly independent of each other. Farrer expresses sympathy with the notion that Mark may have been written "with a view to church reading" and that "if St Mark had his eye on the calendar, his book might be expected to reflect the order and topics of the Jewish year",[3] but he is prepared to go much farther than Carrington in regarding Mark as a mystical composition. He believes that its structure reflects not only triads, pentads, and heptads, but a complex of cycles, paracycles, and annexes. It follows a rhythmic cycle and its stories are interwoven with theological symbolism and based on an "allegorical arithmetic".[4] It is not easy to tell whose symbolism and whose arithmetic this is, for in Farrer's view Mark is inspired in the sense that two mentalities operated simultaneously when he was writing, his own and the Holy Spirit's, and now one, now the other, seems to be master of the situation.[5]

Farrer's book is not one which will appeal to the philologist or historian. His mystical significances too frequently override his text and his rhythmic cycles are established at times by the most extraordinary shifts in the meanings of words. Errors like his statement that the Pharisees said that God reserves "the divine authority of judgment", but Daniel says "he confers it on the Son of Man",[6] are

[1] P. 8. [2] Pp. 92–3. [3] P. 33. [4] P. 298.
[5] Cf. my review in *The Cambridge Review*, LXXIII, No. 1791, p. 550.
[6] P. 271.

too frequent and too flagrant. Admirers of the Farrer's *Glass of Vision* and *Rebirth of Images* will, however, be fascinated by this further development of his theory of inspiration.

The most matter-of-fact of the three books we are considering is Vincent Taylor's, which is unquestionably his most solid and independent contribution to the study of the Gospels. It contains the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, with some modifications due mainly to new estimates imposed by the Chester Beatty papyri, full textual and exegetical notes, an introduction with valuable chapters on Marcan style and usage, the literary analysis of the Gospel, and its literary and historical value. A number of detached notes and eleven appendices at the end treat questions of interest and importance. He believes that Mark was composed by Peter's companion John Mark at Rome between A.D. 68 and 70.

Taylor is a convinced *Formgeschichtler,* and his isolation and analysis of the small nuclei which he believes Mark has taken over from current oral tradition form one of the most instructive sections of his work. Not all critics will agree with his dissections of the narrative nor find it easier to resort to *Gemeindetradition* than to the vagaries of Mark's literary method. This is particularly the case in the dismemberment of the Passion narrative into a Roman Passion Story and a Petrine tradition which leaves little play for Mark as an author in one of the most effective portions of his work. The role of catechism and liturgy in the formation of Mark's materials have been so consistently emphasized in the last thirty years that it now seems eccentric to question it. It is, however, useful to remember that it is almost entirely conjectural and is confirmed by nothing we know of Christian education on worship in the earliest period. Traditions which have become as set and stylized as Taylor imagines those behind Mark to be are in effect texts, whether they have been recorded on parchment and papyrus or on human memory. Such texts are not found in the speeches in Acts, in the Epistles, or in the Apostolic Fathers. The actual evidence for historical writing among the early Christians takes us no further back than Mark and Q, and both appear to have been works written to inform their readers about the life and teaching of Jesus. It has yet to be proved, in spite of repeated assertions to the contrary, that these were matters of indifference to the early Christian mind. If, as the early Christians believed, God became man, it is not inconceivable that his worshippers were interested to know, as we are, what manner of man he was.

R. P. Casey, O.G.S.

The Just Tax—I

The subject originally suggested to the writer for an article was "The Just Limits of Taxation", but this presented difficulties, for there can be no just limits to an unjust tax; and in due course it became clear that the nature rather than the limits of taxation must be considered. But with so large a field, if the subject is not to be lost in

a general discussion of the nature of just government, a great many assumptions must be made.

The title chosen has reference to "The Just Price", a matter in which the Church has a *locus standi*. Nowadays, when the Government expends over 40 per cent. of the national income, so large a proportion of price is made up of taxation that for this reason alone it becomes necessary to face the problem of the moral basis of taxation; and in fact taxation takes so large a place in everyday life that the challenge cannot be escaped.

This article, therefore, has been written in the hope of opening up thought and discussion on a subject on which it is imperative that Christians should clarify their thoughts. It has devolved upon the writer because no one better qualified would undertake it, and it is put forward rather more for the purpose of gaining information than of giving it.

It will be well to start by asserting what seem to be the relevant principles of justice in the matter; and in this part of the article the paper on *Christian Philosophy in the Common Law* by Richard O'Sullivan, Q.C.,[1] has been found particularly useful.

It is evident that the first principle is that of *consent*. Wealth, labour, and money, have been exacted from people by *force majeure* since the beginning of history, but such exactions are the very type of injustice, the commonplace of tyranny; for they ignore the fact that "by virtue of his nature man is free", and therefore responsible, which the Christian centuries have brought within recognition of the law. Whatever the degree of mercy or moderation shown by the taxing power, or of "equality of sacrifice" experienced by the taxed, *justice* in the Christian sense does not begin to enter into the transaction until it ceases to be unilateral: that is, until a contractual element begins to enter into it, involving the government in obligations to the people in return for the payments received.

Mr O'Sullivan quotes May's *Parliamentary Practice* (1946 edn) to show that the doctrine of consent can be traced to the Church: "by attributing to the Lateran Council of 1215 the motive source, to the practice of the English Church Councils from 1226 onwards the precedents, and to ecclesiastical leaders the principle applied first in connexion with taxes on 'Spiritualities' that taxation demands both representation and consent."

So much has been heard in recent centuries of the principle of "no taxation without representation" that we are in danger of forgetting that representation is a secondary thing, a mere method of ascertaining consent which in any particular instance must stand or fall by its effectiveness. Consent is the fundamental thing, and it is the implications of consent to taxation which seem to be insufficiently appreciated.

From this point of view there seem to be three aspects of taxation which need to be considered: first, the *purpose* of the tax; second, its *constitution* or composition, in the sense of the stuff of which it is

[1] Aquinas Papers No. 6, Blackfriars Publications, Oxford, 1947.

made; third, its *amount*. Whenever the taxpayer concerns himself only with the third aspect it is a sure sign that consent is lacking; to him it is merely an impost, a lash under which he seeks to escape as lightly as possible.

The first desideratum for consent is that the purpose of the tax must be sufficiently explicit to be approved or disapproved by the taxpayers. The just tax is in fact a *price*, the price of something undertaken, and which ought to be carried out, by the government; and a price attached to no ascertainable thing is almost unavoidably an imposition and a fraud.

There is, however, one function and duty of government so fundamental that the consent of the governed to it must be assumed—namely, the maintenance of what is called "law and order", upon which the very existence of the community depends. But this implies also that the rulers shall not impose their own will on others under the name of law, but regard themselves as "holding the ring" so that a Natural Law, which is acknowledged to be higher than the Government's law, may operate in society, preventing the imperfections of men from upsetting its balance beyond recovery. The primary purpose of a just tax is thus the maintenance of a just government, defined as a government "under God and the Law". That such a government must have a balanced constitution, providing checks upon absolute power by a separation of powers within the State, is well enough known; but to enlarge upon this aspect is beyond the scope of this article.

The function of defence against external attack is also often claimed to be equally fundamental, since the existence of the community is said equally to depend upon it. But very often it is the existence of the particular government in power rather than the existence of the community which is threatened; and the extent to which the people will willingly defend a government gives an indication of the extent to which it governs with the consent of the people. Obviously a government which imposes a heavy burden of unwanted taxation will have to rely on compulsion for its defence, for a large proportion of the taxpayers might well prefer to exchange it for another government rather than endure, and inflict upon others, the horrors of war.

In recent years the Christian conscience of many who are not themselves in sympathy with pacifism has established the right of conscientious objection to military service. This is again a matter of consent; but if it be admitted that it is wrong to force a man against his conscience to fight or kill, there can be no case for regarding it as right to force him to pay others to do these things for him. Certain pacifists who went to gaol before the last war for their refusal to pay a proportion of their income tax which they reckoned to be spent on military preparation took up a more consistent and respectable position in relation to their belief than did those who tried to contract out only when they were required to use the armaments for which they had helped to pay.

Whatever be the right in this difficult matter there can be no hope

of reaching it unless the defence tax is specific, as, originally, in English history, it was. But as the tax was broadened in purpose and application into a general source of revenue, resistance to it developed; and it is surely significant that the two great struggles for the establishment of the principle of consent to taxation were largely concerned with scutage and ship-money, both examples of taxes of this kind.

In other matters it was in former times even more obvious that a tax was a bargain between rulers and taxpayers. Much of the freedom which we still enjoy, or enjoyed until recently, was bought for us by hard bargaining between our predecessors and their Norman rulers. When the burgesses of Leicester agreed with the Earl to pay a threepenny rate on gabled houses in the High Street in return for the right of trial by jury instead of by combat, they got something specific and worth having for their money, and it was in this spirit that Parliament functioned in its early days.

It can scarcely be denied that the great liberating influence which moderated the feudal system and established the concept of the free and responsible man of the Common Law, governed by his own consent, was the Christian religion, as brought to bear by the Church upon rulers as well as ruled. To-day the contrast could hardly be more marked. Parliament, far from being the main check and limitation on taxes, is itself the Power which imposes the heaviest taxation in history and admits of no limitation to its powers in doing so. Its taxes are unspecific and unidentifiable as to purpose, being lost in a general budget, so that the whole idea of consent or resistance to them on grounds of purpose has been by-passed. In practice, the over-riding purpose of modern taxation is usually a matter of the application of a financial or economic theory or policy which few taxpayers could understand, even if they had time for the necessary study, or would be likely to assent to if they understood. Furthermore, Parliament no longer considers that it derives its authority from the consent of free and responsible individuals, but from the right of a secret, anonymous, and therefore completely irresponsible statistical majority to over-ride the will of individuals or minorities.

This departure from the Christian conceptions would be less serious if Christians were less confused about it. The prevailing idea of justice has become comparative; a matter of "fairness" in the distribution of rewards and punishments between classes or individuals, rather than that which is based upon Natural Law and the sanctity of agreement between free and responsible men. The writer is no expert on the New Testament, but to him the parable of the workers in the vineyard appears quite clearly to contrast these two conceptions of justice, and to say that the second is that which obtains in the kingdom of heaven.

These elementary facts may well seem sufficiently obvious not to need iteration, but political events in recent years show that their significance is not widely grasped, even among churchpeople. As the State has taken over more and more of the functions previously performed by people in voluntary association the principle of consent

has been jettisoned on every occasion, without much serious opposition from any accepted moral authority. Some general warnings have been issued from time to time, by church leaders and others, about the danger of too much interference with personal freedom and responsibility, but seldom have these warnings been sufficiently explicit to exert influence on events, neither have they given evidence of an active faith in the alternative to what was being done.

When the critical stage in this long retreat was reached with the foundation of the Welfare State, the case for retaining the consent of participants, at least by conceding to them the right to contract out of paying for services which they did not want, or which they preferred to receive on the customary voluntary basis, was very nearly allowed to go by default; very nearly, but not quite. For the National Insurance and Health Service Acts, being specific as to purpose, and establishing services to be paid for in part by specific taxes which it was found expedient to call by the name of "contributions", suggestive of their customary voluntary nature, offered an exceptional opportunity for raising the issue of consent in the form of the right to contract out. In the event a small group of people supported by two weekly papers (*The Weekly Review*, formerly *G.K.'s Weekly*, and *The Social Crediter*) made a determined effort to secure this right, and succeeded so far as to make it an issue which was brought before the Government through a petition to the King, and was discussed both in Parliament and by the medical profession.

The writer has not yet forgotten the bewilderment of many people, who had always regarded the right of consent in such matters as fundamental to a Christian society, when they discovered that it was being defended only by such slender forces. A special effort was made to gain the support of most of the Christian communions, and an appeal was made to the Lords Spiritual as representing the moral authority of the Established Church in Parliament; but in general the issue was not recognized as having any great importance to the Church or to the Christian faith, the arguments of expediency, of administrative convenience, and of compulsory "charity", won the day, and the Welfare State was given a structure which cannot tolerate the principle of consent, and which therefore is unchristian.

Nevertheless the issue was raised and is alive; and so soon as the necessary faith is recovered the principles of consent and of responsibility can and will be restored to our national life.

In this connexion a recent suggestion in the Church Assembly that the Church Rate might be restored on a voluntary basis is encouraging. What was wrong with the old Church Rate was that it was compulsory upon dissenters and others who did not consent to its purpose. It should not have been abolished, but the right to contract out of it should have been allowed. If restored now on that basis, it would provide a useful precedent and example of what a just tax ought to be: that is, specific as to purpose and paid only by those who consent to that purpose, who also will enjoy to a greater extent than others the benefits derived from what they have willingly paid to maintain.

There is no particular intellectual difficulty in devising a parliamentary and electoral system which would work on these lines. All that is lacking is sufficient faith in what St Thomas Aquinas calls the *law of liberty*[1] as compared with that implicit reliance upon compulsion which prevails, even among Christians, in the world to-day. When this faith begins to stir and to recover its courage, as the writer feels that it is beginning to stir, it will move the petty mountains of government and bureaucracy as it has moved them before, and we cannot be too soon in preparing in thought and in action for that movement.

Obviously, the secret ballot, which makes the voter into an irresponsible statistical unit and the triumph of irresponsibility a mathematical certainty, must be abolished. It is a mystery why it has not been opposed by an informed body of Christian opinion ever since its introduction in 1872, since it transforms the electoral system into a system of mass temptation in which each voter is invited to vote himself benefits at the expense of other people with the certainty that the responsibility can never be brought home to him. At the same time the purely numerical handling of the results ensures that the population must be grouped into classes struggling for gain, or to limit the loss, from taxation, thus rendering the culmination of class war in some sort of communist State merely a matter of time, so long as this policy is persisted in.

This spirit of irresponsibility which is inherent in the political system is now spreading and permeating the rest of life; for the universal excuse of "circumstances beyond control", making it difficult or impossible for individuals fully and honestly to honour their obligations, is too great a temptation for many people, who are liable to add their own little bit of fraud or inefficiency to the snowball, under the justifiable conviction that where so much has gone before it is unlikely to be distinguished from the rest. The enormous increase in costs due to taxation also acts as a cloak to profiteering, a cause of widespread suspicion and ill-will, and a discouragement to responsible initiative and effort on a small scale. What we are witnessing is the undermining of that individual credit upon which a voluntary society rests.

If this evil tendency is to be reversed it will mean carrying the war into the enemy's camp, the invasion of the field of politics by the ordinary standards of responsible conduct as established in a largely Christian society. When this happens voting will necessarily be open and recorded, so that the voter can take responsibility for his choice and also receive the consequences, whether good or bad, in order that he may appreciate what he is prepared to mete out to others. The right to contract out will be greatly extended, and if the parties are to survive they must present their programs in a responsible way, as tenders showing the estimated cost of the separate items, taxation being afterwards allocated according to the recorded voting.

[1] *Sum. Theol.*, Q. 108, art. 1; *The Dominican English translation*, VIII, 306, 1942.

The fact that any such system would embody principles the opposite of those which prevail at present ought not to discourage people from considering it very seriously, for it is evident that the wrong principles are in operation now; and from the point of view of those who look for immediate applications there are many more than are commonly realized, including matters already mentioned; but it is difficult to approach special cases with confidence until the general lines of advance are clear in the mind.

GEOFFREY DOBBS.

(*To be concluded*)

What is Meant by Succession?

DR LEONARD HODGSON in the recent symposium *The Nature of the Church* points out that in the Church of England the "evangelical lays stress on continuity through witness, etc., the catholic through succession, in ordination" (p. 141 footnote). The Church neither asks nor answers the question whether apostolic faith or apostolic ordination constitute the ministry.

This article is an attempt to investigate within a limited period (1547–1603) what is meant by "succession" or "apostolic succession".

Succession, for the Anglican Fathers of this period, generally meant holding the same doctrine as the primitive Church; it was the retention of the true scriptural faith.[1] What is meant by apostolic succession must be decided before proceeding further. In this connexion it is worth remembering that there is a difference between a fact and the interpretation of it. The New Testament mentions the fact of succession, but gives no theory about it. Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus interpret it; the former holds that the proper order of conducting divine worship necessitates a descent from the apostles: the latter maintains that it is a guarantee of the truth taught by the bishops. Hence apostolic succession is something which concerns the episcopate.[2]

The apostolic succession of the great sees was emphasized from an early date. It was made apparent in the gnostic controversy.[3] There was an open continuous succession of bishop to bishop. It implied a succession of lawfully appointed officers rather than succession by ordination.[4] There was no idea that the validity of a bishop's consecration depended upon this succession or that the succession depended upon any spiritual gifts received at ordination. Later, bishops

[1] R. Field, *De Ecclesia* (ed. 1847), Vol. I, pp. 81 and 84; R. Sandys, *Works* (Parker Society), p. 95; N. Ridley, *Works* (Parker Society), p. 158; and J. Jewel, *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. III, pp. 348–9.

[2] Acts 14. 23, Titus 1. 5; H. F. Hamilton, *The People of God* (1912), Vol. II, p. 121.

[3] Cf. C. H. Turner in *Early History of the Church and Ministry* (ed. H. B. Swete, 1918), p. 96, A. Harnack, *The Constitution and Law of the Church*, pp. 121–5, *passim*.

[4] Cf. T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry* (1910), p. 244, and H. Burn-Murdoch, *Church, Continuity and Unity* (1945).

were spoken of in their personal capacity as successors of the apostles, and they performed the functions of the apostles.[1]

The third view is succession by ordination. Headlam remarks that on this view the coming of the gifts depended upon this fact of transmission. Despite ambiguity, this succession and transmission by ordination is necessary for a valid ministry and the due performance of the sacraments. He denies that this view is held in the early Church, describing the theory as an incorrect theological interpretation, and he quotes C. H. Turner that it may lead to a mechanical conception of the sacraments.[2]

These points require further comment. Anglicans to-day are said to repudiate the view that the Spirit is transmitted from one generation to another by the mere contact of the sacramental laying on of hands "like a contagion".[3] When the idea of apostolic succession was first enunciated the emphasis was on the bishop's official succession to his predecessor in office.[4] Succession by the laying on of hands by other bishops is not emphasized. The language used applied to succession not from consecrator to consecrated, but from predecessor to successor. To belong to such a succession certain qualifications were required. The true succession consisted of those who continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and in the fellowship.[5] Here Turner's conclusion is Elizabethan in its tone and it is time to deal with their writings.

Succession for Tudor Anglican divines might mean succession in place or succession in belief. Succession in belief was regarded as very important;[6] and the claim was made, concerning the former, that Anglican bishops had never intruded in these times; they lawfully succeeded those who had gone before them.[7] Yet there might be a succession of bishops where there was no true church.[8] Succession for them did not denote the handing on of a gift from the one who had been consecrated to one being consecrated. There is one trace only, so far as we know, of the idea of the transmission of authority or sacramental gifts merely by tactual means; and there is not support for any thesis that succession came entirely through episcopal ordination.

There is, however, the one exception to the general teaching. This is found in the Catechism of Justus Jonas, commonly called "Cranmer's Catechism", put forth under the authority of Cranmer, even if not translated by him, shortly before 1550. Here, after stating that Christ sent the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, the author goes on:

---

[1] Harnack, op.cit., pp. 125–6.

[2] Headlam, *Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, pp. 125–7; cf. C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry* (4th edit. revised), pp. 64, 104–5. Preface to third edition, pp. xiii, xxxi–ii.

[3] *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 200.

[4] C. H. Turner, *Catholic and Apostolic; Collected Papers* (1931), p. 281; cf. *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, p. 105.

[5] See *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, pp. 107–8, 143, 193.

[6] R. Field, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 82 ff.

[7] Jewel, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 339, and Vol. I, p. 402.

[8] Field, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 83–4.

"they sent their disciples and other godly and learned men, and to them they gave the Holy Ghost by laying their hands upon their heads".[1] This sentence has been stated to be Cranmer's "personal teaching",[2] but beside it must be set statements made by him in 1540. Though the question (No. 9) was asked whether the apostles had authority given to them by God in making bishops when there was no Christian king, he does not answer "yes". Rather he says that generally "comely ceremonies and solemnities" are not vital, though laying on of hands is not specifically mentioned here. Later it is said that "sometime the apostles, and other . . . sent or appointed ministers of God's word; and sometime the people did choose such". Consecration is not essential for bishop or priest.[3]

In view of this conflict of opinions one cannot say that the personal teaching of Cranmer was a theory of tactual succession by laying on of hands without a great deal of qualification.

Episcopal ordination was the proper method, indeed some of our authors would have used stronger language, but holding the faith, sense of vocation, trial by examination, were also desirable and essential.

The requirement of "apostolic succession" has been explained by the assertion that there belongs to bishops and only to them "the powers to perpetuate the ministry in its several grades, by the transmission" of authority received from the apostles. The corollary is that no ministry except one received by episcopal ordination can be legitimately or validly exercised in the Church.[4] Traces of such language in these terms do not appear in these Anglican Fathers and the whole weight of their outlook and opinion was against it. Keble states that they do not advance the exclusive claim of episcopal succession or connect succession with validity of sacraments.[5] He outlines the view held by Saravia, Bilson, and others. But Saravia does not support the idea advanced in the above quotation from Bishop Gore; he was concerned with two facts, that bishops are not man-made and that the bishops alone had been divinely appointed to govern the church.[6]

The phrase "apostolic succession" is apparently found only once in these writers, and here Bilson using it states that they "can have no part of the apostolic commission, that have no show of apostolic succession". This is the conclusion of an argument that neither people nor lay-elders succeed the apostles, "but only the pastors and ministers of the word and sacraments". He is arguing against the eldership system at this point and means by apostolic succession a limitation to the episcopate of certain powers and functions.[7] One of the things proper to bishops was singularity in succeeding, and this

[1] P. 196 (Oxford edition of 1829).
[2] *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 200 note 3.
[3] Cranmer, *Remains and Letters* (P.S.), pp. 117 f.
[4] C. Gore, op. cit., p. 105.
[5] See Keble's Introduction to Hooker's *Works* (ed. 1836), p. lix.
[6] See Keble, pp. lxvi f. *passim*.
[7] *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church* (ed. 1842), p. 162, and cf. p. 157.

has descended from the apostles' time by a perpetual chair of succession and thus their succession is apostolic.[1] Here the idea stressed is succession in place to safeguard unity and transmit the apostolic deposit of faith. He later says that in their imposing of hands and succeeding in the chair bishops are distinguished from presbyters. This supports the view that orderly succession in place was his meaning.[2] Because of its proved value and antiquity Bilson advocates the retention of episcopacy, but not on the ground of "no bishop, no church",[3] and it is not merely by the succession of each bishop that apostolic faith and unity are preserved, but by that of all.[4]

So, in one of the strongest defenders and advocates of episcopacy in our period, the concept found of apostolic succession is that of maintaining the faith and lawfully succeeding a predecessor in a sequence going back to some apostle. That this interpretation is correct is supported by the fact that Laud, in controversy with Fisher, the Jesuit, takes the same standpoint, devoting several pages to proving that local, personal, and visible succession is not and has not been a mark of the Church. Succession was not tied to place or person, but to verity of doctrine.[5]

H. F. Woodhouse.

American Letter: No. 14

The eminent American literary critic Mr Joseph Wood Krutch recently had an essay in the weekly *The Nation*, in which he commented on two symposia on the general subject of religion and the intellectuals. The particular books are not important for this letter, but a point raised by Mr Krutch is. Although he had serious reservations about the real identification of most of the authors in the two symposia with the Christian tradition, he observed that these writers had discovered that Christians can make value judgments and Christians can make decisions in a world where the situation demands that people do both.

He suggested that many of the avant-garde writers in England and America had tried to swallow the traditions, sacraments, and structure of Christianity without chewing them, because of their personal need to be able to make choices. The pervading relativism of western culture has brought to sensitive minds a despair which is intolerable and about which something has to be done.

This essay on religion and the intellectuals actually points to a situation which has far more general significance than just the need of literary men to find a way for themselves personally to identify themselves creatively with the world in which they find themselves in spite of its tensions and contradictions. The Christian Church itself needs to turn to Christianity for the same reason, although with perhaps more balanced understanding than Mr Krutch sees the writers as having.

[1] Pp. 316 and 319–20. [2] P. 332. [3] P. 333.
[4] P. 341. [5] *Works*, Vol. II, pp. 421 ff., and cf. Vol. VI, p. 573.

The cumulative tensions of the world situation since V-J day, including the whole range of reactions against international Communism, but not limited to them, have produced a moral climate in this country where it is not so much a question of the difficulty of making practical decisions as it is of feeling a real meaning in the decisions one is forced to make. The anti-Communist spectrum—from Point 4 at one end to hysteria at the other—highlights rather than defines the situation.

The fact is that the liberal mind, within the Churches as well as in the world generally, is finding increasing difficulty in retaining confidence in categories of critical judgment on social questions. By the liberal mind here is meant first of all the general attitude toward social change which has been known as liberal in England and America, but by implication such an attitude refers in turn to liberalism as understood in philosophy. It is in this last sense that American culture must be regarded as liberal, and this liberalism has become by and large the prevailing point of view of leaders within the Churches as well as in society at large.

Christian leaders tend to make their analyses of social conditions on the basis of the categories of liberal philosophy, which means that the Christian tradition comes to serve the purpose of reinforcing certain ethical discriminations. While it is alleged more often than not that the ethical discriminations are themselves derived deductively from Christianity, usually through the moral insights of Jesus, this is not really the case. There is an unconsciously accepted premise that the function of religion—Christian or any other—is to clarify, reinforce, and make possible the fulfilment of ethical demands; so that the real issue in social analysis is ethical.

The domination of American thinking by liberal philosophy tends to lead generally to a relativism as regards pragmatic choices—whether that relativism is naturalistic or instrumentalistic does not matter. This does not mean that people are unable to make any choices at all, but it does mean that, whether or not they admit it, their choices are made in accordance with a sliding scale of ethical values in which one is expected not to place any great strain on any particular point in the scale. Thus ethical Christianity, even for loyal churchmen, tends to blend with comparative religion in this area of social action—and that which is distinctively Christian is taken to be an emphasis on the love commandment as focused in the Christian tradition but implied almost everywhere.

When people are forced to make serious social choices, as they are in this present world situation, they cannot help but see a seriousness of consequences which do not seem to be adequately accounted for by the gentle categories of a liberal ethic. The reaction is often to seek to change one's relationship to the situation by *tour de force*. This is what Mr Krutch sees the "religious" intellectuals doing. Mr Whittaker Chambers in another sense is doing the same thing by his dichotomy, in his book *Witness*,[1] between God and Communism,

[1] This autobiographical work by the man whose testimony figured prominently in the trials of Alger Hiss has been exciting widespread interest in the U.S.A.

since God is really undefined. More significant than the book itself is the fervour with which it has been seized, not simply by defenders of the *status quo* who would be expected to approve anything purporting to be anti-Communist, but by many who have given much in time and energy to tasks of social amelioration. The reason suggested is that Mr Chambers seems to offer them a better category, even though an undefined one, for relating themselves to a world where nobody can stay neutral, yet where the traditional liberal can find no place upon which to stand.

The general statements which have been made can be documented at length when it comes to describing the relationship of American Protestantism to the social scene in this country and in the world at large. The pronouncements of the commissions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America (formerly the Federal Council) do not have the note of Mr Chambers' sharp but questionable dichotomy. Rather they highlight the frustration which leads to various extreme reactions, such as that of Mr Chambers, because they still appeal to a Christian ethic as if the problems of the atom bomb and industrial relations were primarily questions of courses of action rather than of life's meaning for those involved. Certainly choices of courses of action are involved, but people do not actually arrive at decisions on this level by logical deduction from previously accepted general premises.

The Joint Commission on Social Reconstruction of the Episcopal Church in its report to the General Convention of the Church in September presented largely a list of resolutions approving certain aspects of national policy, such as Point 4, and implementing by further ecclesiastical legislation the positions of the National Council of Churches. This seems to be a particularly barren way to relate confused people to a torn world. If men and women are merely uncertain about what to do, how to vote, whether to agree with Point 4 or not, or how to understand when the use of the atom bomb may be legitimate, such a report might provide them with guide-posts, but that is not the problem of people within the Church to-day any more than it is of the general public. The confusion is deeper, more profound, more helpless, because it involves a loss of confidence in the categories of liberal philosophy on the part of people who more often than not cannot use philosophical interpretations at all, but yet who must use some categories in order to think at all.

There are indications of the possible development of a more dynamic understanding of the relationship of the Christian Church to the social scene, however, and that needs to be watched. There is an increasing interest in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and a rediscovery which is still very tentative of a creative doctrine of the Church. Episcopalians may become increasingly indebted to the work of Dr Frederick W. Dillistone, who has returned to England from this country, for making a very valuable contribution to this badly needed reorientation. The work of Dr Theodore O. Wedel, while not specifically addressed to this problem of social relationships, has been of very great significance, as his *The Christianity of*

Main Street[1] followed his widely read *The Coming Great Church.*

It is also very interesting to note that the leaders of the new curriculum development movement within the Episcopal Church, while starting off with the intention of supplying more adequate Sunday-school lessons, have moved steadily in the development of what they call a "relationship" theology—the term in this usage is Dr Wedel's. The Sunday-school lessons, when they come, will be in the context of a dynamic conception of Church membership in a vital fellowship, which will mean that their orientation will be only incidentally ethical and formal. At least this is the hope of many of those who are in the forefront of this movement.

It may seem a far cry from a discussion of the Christian Education developments of the Episcopal Church to the problem of the frustration of literary intellectuals with which this letter began, but what is suggested here is that the direction in which the educators are moving may provide the most fruitful source of a new confidence in terms of which people may make creative decisions. It will certainly be a more useful direction in which to seek for religious insights than simply trying to swallow whole the accumulated traditions, myths, sacramental interpretations and practices, and lore and cult of the Christian Church.

CHARLES D. KEAN.

Great Preachers—XX. Latimer

IT is recorded that a contemporary, favourably inclined to Latimer, asked, "Did there any man flourish, I say not in England only but in any nation of the world since the apostles, who preached the gospel more sincerely, freely, and honestly than Hugh Latimer, bishop of Worcester?"[2] The language is flatterous and betrays ignorance of the great figures in earlier ages of Christian preaching, but it witnesses to the significance of "this worthy and old practised soldier of Christ, master Hugh Latimer", in the time of the first beginnings of the English reformation. He believed in the vocation of the preacher in the church of God, "it is the instrument and the thing whereby we are saved".[3] He considered that this office, faithfully discharged, would do more than anything else to reform the church and to restore the Christian good of England. He sought to fulfil it himself and urged its solemn importance upon his contemporaries. "Preaching of the gospel is one of God's plough works and the preacher is one of God's ploughmen."[4]

---

[1] Macmillan, 7s. 6d. Reviewed on p. 398 *infra*.

[2] *Sermons and Letters of Latimer:* R.T.S., London, 1831, p. xii. The works of Latimer are most easily accessible in the two volumes of the Parker Society edition by G. E. Corrie; *Sermons* (1844), *Remains* (1845). The latter volume contains fifteen sermons, besides letters and other documents. All subsequent references are to these two volumes.

[3] *Sermons*, pp. 67, 155, 291.

[4] *Sermons*, p. 60.

It was the singular fortune of Latimer to pass his days in the troublous years of the first half of the sixteenth century, when the old order of religion and society, as well in England as elsewhere, was giving place to the new influences flowing in from an expanding economy and a revival of classical and scientific learning. He was born at Thurcaston in the county of Leicester, a few years after the strong hands of Henry Tudor had seized the reins of power, probably about 1490. From the common schools of his own county he proceeded to the university of Cambridge, becoming a fellow of Clare Hall in the autumn of 1509. At the first, though distinguished for "sanctimony of life" and studious habits, he was, as he testified of himself in later years, "as obstinate a papist as any was in England, insomuch that when I should be made bachelor of divinity, my whole oration went against Philip Melancthon and against his opinions". Bilney, or "rather Saint Bilney that suffered death for God's word sake", who heard this oration, took it upon himself to visit the preacher, and by way of an urgent plea that Latimer should hear his confession declared to him the truth as it is in Jesus. "From that time forward I began to smell the word of God and forsook the school doctors and such fooleries."[1]

Latimer then gave himself, as Wesley was to do in a later century, to such pastoral duties as lay at hand in a university town, in regular preaching, sick visiting, and ministering to the prisoners in the Tower at Cambridge. Complaints were laid against his preaching and he was summoned before Cardinal Wolsey. It appeared on examination that the complaints were merely frivolous, and the cardinal expressed his confidence in Latimer by giving him a licence to preach throughout England. Within twelve months of this episode Latimer was made one of the royal chaplains, when it was known that he was of the party in the university said to be favourable to the king's divorce from Catherine of Aragon. In 1531 he accepted nomination by the Crown to the benefice of West Kington in Wiltshire. There, in the words of Foxe, "this good preacher did exercise himself to instruct his flock; and not only to them his diligence extended, but also to the country about".[2]

In the late summer of 1535 he was appointed bishop of Worcester, and his advancement to the dignity and degree of a bishop was most welcome to Cranmer. In his own diocese he devoted himself with great assiduity to visiting, teaching, exhorting, correcting, and reforming. Whenever possible he preached twice on each Lord's Day. He was required to take some part in church affairs at the centre and was made a member of the commission which in 1537 put forth *The Institution of a Christian Man*. He resolutely opposed the passing of the Act of Six Articles which, among other things, made it a capital offence to impugn transubstantiation, communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, and private masses, and as a consequence re-

[1] *Sermons*, pp. 334–5; cf. Strype, *Eccl. Mem.*, iii. 1, p. 368.
[2] *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe:* ed. Josiah Pratt (4th ed.), R.T.S., London, N.D., Vol. VII, p. 454.

signed his bishopric on 1 July 1539. He experienced alternate periods of freedom and imprisonment between that date and the death of Henry VIII early in 1547, so that his public usefulness was severely restricted. Soon after the accession of the young Edward VI the see of Worcester was again offered to Latimer, but he declined the proposal by reason of his age and infirmities and of his desire to devote himself to preaching and to "aiding the injured and oppressed", amongst the ordinary subjects of the king. During the most part of this reign he was diligent in preaching as well in London before the king as in many other parts of the realm, and it was while engaged on this work in Coventry in the autumn of 1553 that he was summoned before the Privy Council early in the reign of Queen Mary and committed to the Tower. Two years later, in October 1555, after several examinations before commissioners appointed to inquire into his opinions, in company with Bishop Ridley of London, he was martyred in Oxford.

Latimer was, to a pre-eminent degree, a preacher of personal and social righteousness. He lived in an age in which churchmen were beginning to recover a sense of sin as a grievous offence against the will and love of God, an offence which left the sinner unable to do anything but to cast himself in despairing hope upon the mercy of God. The makers of the English Prayer Book in the same period gave expression in language finely fitted for common use, to this awakening consciousness of the true gravity of sin. For too long ecclesiastical authority had been content to heal slightly the hurt of the daughter of the Lord's people. When the Convocation of Canterbury met in the summer of 1536 Latimer was appointed by the primate to preach the opening sermons. He took the opportunity to speak plainly of the many and grievous sins of the clergy which had reduced the nation and the church to so perilous a condition. Taking as his text the parable of the unjust steward, the preacher drew out an analogy with the stewards of the patrimony of the Lord in England, and pressed home his accusations with an abundance of illustration and detailed application. "The church is his household, which ought with all diligence to be fed with his word and sacraments; . . . brethren, if a faithful steward ought to do as I have said, I pray you ponder and examine this well, whether our bishops and abbots, prelates and curates, have been faithful stewards or no? Ponder whether yet many of them be as they should or no? . . . were there not some that despising the money of the Lord as copper and not current, either coined new themselves or else uttered abroad newly coined of other; sometime either adulterating the word of God or else mingling it, sometime in the stead of God's word blowing out the dreams of men." God would say to us ". . . I commanded you that with all industry and labour, ye should feed my sheep: ye earnestly feed yourselves from day to day, walking in delights and idleness. You preach very seldom and when ye do preach, do nothing but hinder them that preach truly, as much as lieth in you."[1] This

[1] *Sermons*, pp. 35, 36, 38.

extract gives a very fair impression of the style and method of Latimer as a preacher. He inherited and adapted for his purposes the medieval tradition of preaching, with its use of analogies, illustrations and anecdotes, expressed in direct and vigorous language seasoned with a rude humour calculated to make a point stick in the minds of his hearers.

Preaching before Edward VI in April 1549, Latimer turned the attention of his distinguished congregation to what he regarded as the great evil of the day, and source of all other evils, the general neglect of regular gospel preaching. His point was sharpened by an anecdote and an autobiographical allusion. "I heard of a bishop of England that went on visitation, and as it was the custom when the bishop should come, and be rung into the town, the great bell's clapper was fallen down, the tyall was broken, so that the bishop could not be rung into the town. There was a great matter made of this, and the chief of the parish were much blamed for it in the visitation. The bishop was somewhat quick with them and signified that he was much offended. They made their answers and excused themselves as well as they could: 'It was a chance,' said they 'that the clapper brake, and we could not get it mended . . . it shall be amended as shortly as may be.' Among the other, there was one wiser than the rest, and he comes me to the bishop: 'Why, my lord', saith he, 'doth your lordship make so great a matter of the bell that lacketh his clapper? Here is a bell', said he and pointed to the pulpit, 'that hath lacked a clapper this twenty years. We have a parson that fetcheth out of this benefice fifty pounds every year, but we never see him.' I warrant you, the bishop was an unpreaching prelate . . . Ever this office of preaching hath been least regarded, it hath scant had the name of God's service." Then the preacher proceeded to the further illustration of his theme by a fragment of personal reminiscence. He recalled that on one occasion, riding on a journey homewards from London, he gave notice that he would preach in a certain town the next morning, that day being a holiday, "and me thought it was a holiday's work". He expected on arrival to find a great company gathered at the church, but the door of the building was still fast locked. When at length the key was produced "one of the parish comes to me and says 'Sir, this is a busy day with us, we cannot hear you: it is Robin Hood's day. The parish are gone abroad to gather for Robin Hood.' I thought my rochet should have been regarded, though I were not; but it would not serve, it was fain to give place to Robin Hood. It is no laughing matter, my friends, it is a weeping matter, a heavy matter under the pretence of gathering for Robin Hood, a traitor and a thief, to put out a preacher, to have his office less esteemed, to prefer Robin Hood before the ministration of God's word, and all this cometh of unpreaching prelates."[1] The voice of the preacher here sounds uncommonly like an echo of the denunciations of highly placed ecclesiastics which were the stock-in-trade of later medieval puritans and reformers. But the medieval

[1] *Sermons*, pp. 207–8; cf. pp. 99, 193, 202, 232, 275.

use of fables and vulgar anecdotes has been largely replaced by autobiographical allusions. It was only to be expected that such frequent and vehement assaults upon the pastoral failures of his brethren exposed Latimer to their dislike and active hostility.

There were other ways in which Latimer followed medieval precedents, especially in the use of elaborate figures of speech and allegories. "Faith is a noble duchess, she hath ever her gentleman-usher going before her—the confessing of sins: she hath a train after her—the fruits of good works, the walking in the commandments of God. He that believeth will not be idle, he will walk; he will do his business. Have ever the gentleman-usher with you. So if you will try faith, remember this rule—consider whether the train be waiting upon her."[1] Latimer's use of Latin tags, the elaborate simile or *exemplum*, are typical of the best popular medieval preaching and show that he was no conscious innovator in the pulpit.

The seven sermons preached before Edward VI in the spring of 1549, when Latimer's powers of preaching were probably at their height, give evidence of his ability to speak directly to the condition of men and of his great range of illustrative matter. The text of each discourse was the same, "Whatsoever things were written before time were written for our learning", which enabled the preacher to roam at large through the Bible. Indeed, the chief fault of Latimer lay in the lack of form in his sermons, with the result that they were often unduly long and rambling. But the sermons on the Lord's Prayer preached to the household of the Duchess of Suffolk in 1552 contain much more exegesis and exposition of short passages of Scripture. Though unsystematic and rambling in discourse, Latimer was never vague and undecided. He was ever ready to counsel his hearers on every aspect of their duty. A survey of the Biblical testimony to the calling and character of kings was accompanied by direct application to the circumstances of sixteenth-century England. "Let the king therefore choose a wife which feareth God; let him not seek a proud wanton and one full of rich treasures and worldly pomp."[2] Latimer never sought either to flatter or to conciliate his hearers, whether courtly or clerical. "Sin must be rebuked; sin must be plainly spoken against."[3] The bitter cry of the poor and the oppressed was never for long absent from the preacher's thoughts, and he launched many attacks on rapacious landlords and unscrupulous "graziers, closers and rent raisers". "You landlords", he burst out, "you rent-raisers, I may say you step lords, you unnatural lords; you have for your possessions yearly, too much. Of this too much cometh this monstrous and portentous dearth made by men, notwithstanding God doth send us plentifully the fruits of the earth."[4] The decay of the universities and the lack of common justice were similar topics which engaged the attention of the preacher. The king was urged to look to the matter. "View your judges and hear poor men's causes. Hear men's suits yourself, I require you in God's behalf, and put it not to the hearing of these velvet coats, those upskips."[5]

[1] *Sermons*, pp. 237–8. [2] *Sermons*, p. 97. [3] *Sermons*, p. 241.
[4] *Sermons*, pp. 98–9. [5] *Sermons*, p. 127.

In spite of his considerable efforts to justify the claim that preaching was the chief instrument of God for the salvation of men, Latimer shared that desolating experience that comes to all ministers of the word, of being overwhelmed by a conviction of the weakness and futility of the preaching office. "Let the preacher preach till his tongue be worn to the stumps, nothing is amended."[1] Nevertheless he exerted a great influence for God and righteousness in his own day, and samples of his pulpit work have found their way into most collections of the great sermons of Christendom. The words which he employed to describe the sermon of Jonah at Nineveh may justly be applied to his own discourses. "This was no great curious sermon, but this was a nipping sermon, a pinching sermon, a biting sermon; it had a full bite, it was a nipping sermon, a rough sermon and a sharp biting sermon."[2]

F. J. Taylor.

[The series of articles on "Great Preachers" is now concluded.—Ed. Theology.]

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Casey is Dean and Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Dr Geoffrey Dobbs is Senior Lecturer in forest botany at the University College of North Wales.

Dr Woodhouse is Professor of Church History at Wycliffe College, Toronto.

Dr Kean is Rector of Grace Episcopal Church, Kirkwood, Missouri.

The Rev. F. J. Taylor is Vicar of Christ Church, Claughton, Birkenhead.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE HEAVENLY SESSION OF CHRIST

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Mr Argyle in your August number makes an interesting point when he says that the New Testament consistently teaches that our Lord will execute judgment sitting upon his throne—in contrast to the Apostles' Creed.

But I wonder whether it is true that the N.T. quite consistently teaches this. There is Phil. 3. 20: "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour . . . who shall fashion anew . . ." and Acts 3. 21: "whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things". It is true that judgment is not specifically spoken of in either place; but resurrection and judgment are

[1] *Sermons,* p. 101; cf. *Remains,* pp. 209–10; cf. The devil "the most diligent prelate and preacher in all England" always in his diocese (*Sermons,* p. 70).

[2] *Sermons,* p. 240.

commonly associated in the N.T. We may also compare 1 Thess. 4. 16: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven", and 2 Thess. 1. 7: ". . . at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven . . . rendering vengeance". These two passages evidently refer to the same event, and the latter passage connects it with judgment.

It must be admitted that the Philippians passage by stating that our *πολίτευμα* is in heaven does not afford much ground for arguing motion from a place.

All I am seeking to contend for is that the Creed and the N.T. are not shown to be in opposition.

Yours faithfully,

14, Cardiff Road,
Cowbridge, Glam.

R. L. Cole.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Body. A study in Pauline theology. By John A. T. Robinson. S.C.M. Press. 7s.

This volume, number 5 in the series of "Studies in Biblical Theology", is a stimulating work. The distinction between the Greek and the Hebrew understanding of "body" having been set forth with masterful clarity, there follows a careful study of St Paul's use of "flesh" and "body", of which the conclusion is that "while *σάρξ* stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, in his distance from God, *σῶμα* stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, as made for God".

Chapter 2 sets out to show how this understanding of "flesh" and "body" links up with the Incarnation of Christ. Here Dr Robinson employs language which has a mythical, even a fairy-story, quality. I do not say that it is false, but it will certainly need translation before it conveys the Gospel to men and women of to-day. "It is in this kind of way that Paul sees Christ dealing with the forces of evil, triumphantly absorbing their attack by untiring obedience, till eventually there is nothing more they can do. Or rather, there is one thing more —and that is to kill him. This they do. But in the very act they confess their defeat. For all they achieve thereby is to deprive him, still inviolate, of the flesh through which alone they have any power of temptation over him. The Resurrection is the inevitable consequence of this defeat."

How, when we have described Christ's work, are we to attach it to the believer so that Christ is not merely example but also redeemer —so that it is not only Christ who has died and been raised, but also the faithful who have died and been raised with him? "Christians have died in, with, and through, the crucified body of the Lord because, and only because, they are now in and of his body in 'the life that he liveth unto God'—viz., the body of the Church."

So we come to chapter 3, which endeavours to show how St Paul's doctrine of the Body holds together the Incarnation and the Church. There is much stirring writing here and revealing exegesis. The depth upon depth of St Paul's Christology is admirably demon-

strated, and the height and depth and width of meaning in the term "The Body of Christ" finely elucidated. But Dr Robinson fails, as it seems to me, to show how St Paul moved from his doctrine of "body" and "flesh" to the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. What factor led him to unite the two?

Dr Robinson's answer is as follows: "When we examine the narratives, we find stressed in each account of Paul's conversion how the heart of the revelation which came to him was the fact that the Church he was trying to stamp out was no other than Jesus Christ himself: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *me*? I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.' The appearance on which Paul's whole faith and apostleship was founded was the revelation of the resurrection body of Christ, not as an individual, but as the Christian community. In the face of this it would seem unnecessary to go further for an explanation why the Body of Christ inevitably meant for him what it did."

No one will deny that Paul is here asserting an intimate connexion between Jesus and his Church. But I doubt whether this exegesis will do. The accounts of the conversion in Acts 9 and 26 have the words, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest", and in 22, still more emphatically, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest". The overriding revelation was the resurrection of Jesus. The resurrection proved that he was the Christ. It is from his theology of the Christ that Paul develops his doctrine of the Body of Christ. He knew from the Scriptures (e.g. Ps. 89) that the Christ was a corporate term. It is likely that he knew that other corporate title for the Christ, derived from *Daniel*, "Son of Man". One might almost say that he could have spoken of the Messianic community as "the body of the Christ" or as being "in the Christ" before he ever became a Christian. Only as a Christian could he say "in Christ Jesus". The fact that to him "the Christ" was a corporate term enabled him to link together his doctrine of the Body of Jesus the Incarnate Christ and of the Body of the Risen Christ. The words "This is my Body" at the Last Supper are, perhaps, the key to the whole matter.

Dr Robinson has given us a study worthy to stand with the other volumes in this series.

St Paul's College,
Grahamstown.

F. C. Synge.

Israel and Palestine. The history of an Idea. By Martin Buber. East and West Library. 18s.

This book, first published some eight years ago in Hebrew, and now translated—from the German edition of 1950—into English, undertakes to describe the history of the national idea in Judaism. The characteristic and unique feature of Israel's nationalism is, so Buber argues, that it consists *a priori* of two elements: it refers not only to a particular people, but also to a particular land. (Witness the word *Zion*ism as the name of a nationalist movement.) If Israel's election means that it is charged with a mission as a "holy nation",

there corresponds to this the election of a "promised" and "holy" land wherein this mission should blossom and give fruit. People and land are bound together by the Covenant that unites both to God. The history of their unifications, separations (exile!) and reunifications takes place within the terms of that Covenant, which is ever valid and governing their mutual relation and destiny.

This dual aspect of election as the joining together of a chosen people and a chosen land is of the highest religious significance. It means nothing less than the interdependence and co-operation in God's purpose of the two spheres of *Nature* and *History*: two spheres of Being that were originally one (think of Adam's fall resulting in the cursing of Nature!) and that are fatally dissociated in our minds. To join them together again, to exemplify the "holy matrimony" of Nature and History, was part of the task for which a despised and small part of the human race, and a small and desolate part of the earth, were chosen. Prof. Buber makes his points by that careful and illuminating exegesis of Biblical texts that has already earned him the gratitude and admiration of so many. The first part of this book, *The Testimony of the Bible*, should prove of utmost value to every serious reader of the Bible.

But to Buber, as a representative Jewish thinker, the Bible is only one—albeit fundamental—stage in Israel's life and witness. His story therefore continues with an equally careful analysis of the testimony of the talmudical period (liturgy, *halakhah*, *aggadah*) and of the "Exile": the voice of scholars, poets, philosophers, and mystics, down to the very latest, Zionist ("political") phase.

Zionism, according to Buber, is not a new thing. It is a continuation, a modern re-statement of an age-old reality. Whether the Zionist venture will fail by its secularism or develop into renewed awareness that the link of people and land is bound up with a divine command and condition—this is its present great problem—and one which is subject to the same Covenant as the problems of three thousand years ago.

By thus pursuing his argument from Biblical theology to modern politics, the author has placed himself in a position where he is exposed to the combined fury of the *rabies theologica* and the *rabies politica*. A Christian will certainly feel unable to accept some of the author's presuppositions. The anti-Zionist may curtly dismiss the book as Zionist propaganda-theology. The pro-Zionist may wish that all Zionism were on this high level. But none will lay the book down without feeling his debt to Prof. Buber increased again.

Leeds University. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky.

The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. By A. J. B. Higgins. S.C.M. Press. 7s.

What is the Mass? By H. Chéry, O.P. Blackfriars. 5s.

In *The Shape of the Liturgy* there occurs a significant but easily unnoticed footnote: "This [viz., the popular preference of the

Johannine chronology of the passion over the Markan], the almost universal conclusion of modern investigators has, however, recently been challenged in Germany, and it is only fair to say that the question is not yet finally settled." Despite this warning, most recent English literature has assumed all too confidently that the question has been settled (e.g. J. E. L. Oulton, *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit*, 1951). Until Jeremias' brilliant work *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, 1949², appears in a long awaited English translation. Mr Higgins' book will serve as a useful introduction to recent continental work on the subject. Having argued for a return to the Markan chronology, and the conclusion that the Last Supper was a passover meal, Mr Higgins attempts to establish the original Eucharistic sayings of Jesus, expounds their meaning, and traces their application and interpretation in the Acts, the Pauline Epistles and the Fourth Gospel. He has accomplished his task with commendable freshness and lucidity. But he has failed to exploit the theological advantages gained by a return to the Markan chronology, as is shown in his handling of *anamnesis* and of the words over the bread and cup. Thus, the anamnesis-command expresses, according to Mr Higgins, "the wish of Jesus that the annual passover should be observed in his *memory*" (p. 55). "The disciples at the Last Supper are . . . to be regarded . . . as *remembering* his sacrificial act" (p. 52). "What is to be emphasized is not the eucharistic elements themselves, but the sacrificial act which they *call to mind*" (p. 53 [italics the reviewer's]. It is not enough to tell us that Jeremias' exegesis of the anamnesis idea as meaning "that God may remember me and bring in the parousia" has been "proved untenable" in a Dutch periodical (footnote 1, p. 55), to which few English readers are likely to have access. On such an important issue we are entitled to know the grounds. Jeremias' phrase may be bald and crude, but the pattern of Biblical prayer, and *a fortiori* the passover liturgy *is* a recalling *before God* of his redemptive acts in the past that he may act here and now by making those acts operative in the present. Perhaps it is not surprising that the name "Dix" occurs only once in a footnote (*vide* index). Similarly on the words over the bread and cup Mr Higgins writes: "The first [erroneous opinion] is the Catholic view that 'is' (ἐστι) must be taken literally—that the bread and wine are in fact, if not in appearance, the actual body and blood of Christ. Such a belief would have been quite impossible for the Jew. The word 'is', which would not be expressed in Aramaic, must signify 'means', 'represents', or 'stands for'" (p. 51). "In the same way the bread and wine in the Eucharist *represent* [italics author's] the atoning sacrifice . . . without themselves possessing any inherent efficacy" (p. 53). Everything depends on what "represents" connotes in Semitic thought, and for that we have to look to the significance of prophetic symbolism, which approximates far more closely to the "Catholic" realism which Mr Higgins condemns. The elements may not possess "inherent" efficacy, but they surely possess a most devastating efficacy as the instruments (*in, mit und unter*) of God's activity (1 Cor. 11. 29–30!). It would be a pity if these unscriptural Zwinglianisms of Mr

Higgins were to blind Anglican readers to the fruitful theological possibilities opened up by a renewed understanding of the Eucharist as the Christian passover.

The second work, translated from the French, is intended for Roman Catholic laity, and is largely informed by the ideals and scholarship of the liturgical movement.

LAMPETER. REGINALD H. FULLER.

MEN AGAINST HUMANITY. By Gabriel Marcel. Foreword by Professor Donald Mackinnon. Harvill Press. 18s.

As a playwright M. Marcel is as good as unknown in this country (the plays are didactic: one is against the marriage of priests, it is about a minister whose wife leaves him for another man), but as a "Christian philosopher" his reputation here must stand high, for he has carried the existentialist war over theism into the enemy's territory and he has been a Gifford lecturer. It is regrettable to have to say that this newly translated book, of which I have not seen the original, is beneath contempt. The first impulse is to laugh it off as the work of a homeopath. The author repeatedly asserts that the book is written to condemn abstraction, and what argument it musters is entirely abstract; it even descends to speaking of "the man in the street". But it has features less amusing, and the more I consider them the more I grow indignant.

To-day there is a test easily applied to any Frenchman. It is how he refers to the Vichy government of the years of German occupation. From this test M. Marcel hardly emerges with flying colours. "The lie of Vichy", he declares, "undoubtedly paved the way for the lies of the Resistance." But what "the lie of Vichy" may have been he significantly refrains from mentioning. A little earlier he does say that if the Dutch escaped "certain evils which we in France continue to suffer", it was thanks to having had "no puppet government". The administration of Marshal Pétain is accused of nothing definite; it is labelled a "puppet government" without a single fact in support. To be hostile to Vichy upon rational grounds is one thing; another to indulge in gratuitous abuse. Strangely enough, moreover, on the same page the salvation of France is said to lie in a return to monarchy; and the equivalent of monarchy, be it noted, was, as M. Charles Maurras has shown in his book, *La Contre-révolution spontanée*, exactly what it was originally intended at Vichy to institute. On top of that, at the end of the book, M. Marcel delivers himself of one among many oracular pronouncements and says: "It is very important to rehabilitate the aristocratic idea." Anybody could say as much without setting up as a philosopher; more to the point would have been to say how the idea is to be rehabilitated, and there again Vichy had some notions.

From Vichy and the Resistance M. Marcel passes to the stale theme of German concentration camps. Why not have told for a change about French concentration camps or about that camp at La Roche-sur-Yon, the commandant of which was reported last year to

have been convicted of beating several German prisoners of war to death? As it is, M. Marcel reproduces a passage from each of two books by women who were interned in Germany during the war, and from the quoted passages draws unwarranted conclusions. Indeed, the whole of his chapter entitled "Techniques of Degradation" is based on a false and preposterous premiss—namely, that the contents of popular books about life in German concentration camps have the value of evidence given in court on oath and duly corroborated. A glance at the loose language of the quoted passages is enough to expose that fallacy; furthermore, the element of sensational embellishment in such books has been dissected and laid bare by M. Paul Rassinier in his *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*. To paraphrase for M. Marcel's benefit the late Wittgenstein, concerning whereof one does not know it is a pity not to be silent!

A lot of the book is taken up with the evils that are thought to have arisen out of totalitarian government, and there is a lot too about sin. But the treatment of the totalitarian evils is external: they are never related to the author's religious faith. There is one sensible passage on the subject of announcements of alleged discoveries of conducting chemical warfare: made in order to intimidate, they have instead, M. Marcel well says, the effect of incitement. Alas, the passage stands alone, and although on almost every page there seems to be something to arrest attention, the aggregate is actually devoid of interest, for it is not about life. How believe that a man hailed as an important philosopher can write, for example, as follows:

> It would be necessary to transcend such data as history and sociology might provide us with in order to isolate, if not exactly the laws, at least the more or less constant conditions, of a social dynamism which imitates life but reaches its climax in what we ought rather to call death: that is, in servitude and terror.

If Whistler could be accused of throwing a pot of paint in the public's face, how describe offering that kind of stuff to the book-buyer?

Mr G. S. Fraser's translation reads agreeably. But a translator needs, if not to know, at least to consult the books referred to in his original. Simone Weil identified the state to-day not with "the gross beast" but with what Plato names in the phrase usually rendered as "the great beast". Again, it is not English to say "poses a question". We say "asks a question", and, for instance, "poses as a pundit".

PETERBOROUGH. MONTGOMERY BELGION.

SHORTER NOTICES

A READING OF GEORGE HERBERT. By Rosemond Tuve. Faber. 25s.

Herbert has suffered at the hands of admirers: Izaak Walton's *Life* sentimentalized the church at Bemerton, and by virtue of his thorough research he resists attempts to supplant him. Modern critics therefore find in *The Temple* only a versified case of conscience in the entry of a member of a noble family into the Church. Miss Tuve

has not written a biography, but studied the imagery and the traditional allegories in the poems, starting from such popular sources of religious didacticism as medieval lyrics, block-books of the Renaissance, miracle plays, and stained glass, all of which are suitably illustrated by text and photograph. The windows are most appropriate, since Herbert's poetry is a moralized *speculum ecclesiae* in itself. *A Reading of George Herbert* provides a link between the daily religion of the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century, offering precise documentation of one of the most notable aspects of the poet's art: his familiarity with the popular idiom both in words and in beliefs which explain the success of ministry. The allegorical interpretations of Christ—as a robber, a bunch of grapes, a rock, and a tree—which are provided in this book enable us to discover afresh the response of the original reader. The windows of King's Chapel, which Herbert obviously knew and *read*, with their antitypes from the Old Testament, are a further source of this rehearsal of Herbert's image-language.

The analysis of "The Sacrifice", though over-long, shows most strongly the poet's allusive and ironic art and comes nearest to the full estimate of a poem, for the method—as may be expected of the author of *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*—is a restricted one, saying nothing of the totality of the work of art, pausing in front of it as at the beauty of a stained-glass window in words. A further study of the religious poetry of the Metaphysicals is required, one in which the rhythm, movement, and the dramatic quality of the verse are not obscured beneath the images, mysticism, and wit. Miss Tuve's *Reading of George Herbert* is the most valuable single contribution we have had towards such a general undertaking for many years.

CAMBRIDGE. MAURICE HUSSEY.

THE GREY FRIARS IN CAMBRIDGE 1225–1538. By J. R. H. Moorman. Cambridge University Press. 35s.

Dr Moorman's recent Birkbeck lectures are here reprinted in extended form. It is arguable that his subject might have been better chosen, for it inevitably resulted in a work of slighter calibre than usual, the text of the lectures forming but half the present book. Medieval friars in general have left comparatively few records behind them, and important areas of the history of Franciscanism in this country have been thoroughly explored, notably in the volumes of the British Society for Franciscan Studies. Thus too often Dr Moorman is inevitably left with little scope; there is, for example, little evidence on the origins of the Cambridge house, and at times he has to draw heavily on the work of his predecessors, his account of the Franciscan buildings at Cambridge inevitably going little beyond that given in Willis and Clark's *Architectural History of the University of Cambridge* and A. R. Martin's *Franciscan Architecture in England*.

Yet there is clearly much to be said for the study of a medieval Franciscan house so important as that at Cambridge, and no one could have performed this task better than Dr Moorman. His enormous knowledge of the general history of the Franciscan order enables him to bring out the full significance of much of the often rather scrappy evidence with which he is concerned, whilst his long and useful appendix of "Biographical Notes on Cambridge Franciscans" (pp. 146–226) is but the most striking manifestation of the long research which underlies the book.

Dr Moorman's view of the conditions of medieval monastic life in its last days may seem to some rather Victorian, but we must thank him for a work singularly lucid and attractive.

CAMBRIDGE. J. C. DICKINSON.

THE PASCHAL MYSTERY. Meditations on the Last Three Days of Holy Week. By Louis Bouyer. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

THE CROWN OF THE YEAR. Weekly Paragraphs for the Holy Sacrament. By Austin Farrer. Dacre Press. 6s.

Père Bouyer's *Le Mystère pascal* is one of the most valuable of recent contributions to liturgical theology, and it was time that it was made available in translation. We cannot agree with the publisher's blurb that this English (or rather American) translation is "superb", but it will have to do. The book takes the form of an exposition of the Roman Catholic liturgical provisions for the last three days of Holy Week, but it amounts to a fresh and illuminating un folding of all the principal themes of the Gospel. Père Bouyer draws freely on Biblical and patristic sources, and does not hesitate to indicate where later liturgical developments have gone astray. Anglicans will be moved to lament the meagre provision of the Book of Common Prayer for this crucial period of the Christian year, and to hope that members of the Church of England may have restored to them more of the liturgical inheritance to which they are surely entitled.

Anglicans commonly indulge in too much sermonizing in Holy Week and participate too little in the liturgy, especially on Good Friday. In general, however, the insistence of the Reformers that the ministry of word and sacrament should be combined was salutary. Dr Farrer's book owes its existence to his recognition of the dilemma that "a sermon at a said eucharist destroys the special character of a simple rite, whereas 'no sermon' leaves the communicants without assistance and divorces the sacrament from the word". He hit upon the happy idea of reading a very carefully prepared paragraph at each Sunday's eucharist in the college chapel where he ministers. What is most appropriate in a college chapel will hardly be suitable, as it stands, in the ordinary parish church, but the same idea could with advantage be worked out elsewhere.

A. R. V.

A Golden Legend of the Slums. By Desmond Morse-Boycott. Illustrated. Skeffington. 18s.

This is a book not only about one slum in particular, Somers Town as it was before the Hitler war, with its saints and rogues, but also about the St Mary of the Angels Song School and its founder, the author of the book.

The book is divided into two parts. The first and longer is mainly about Somers Town. As it consists of a mixture of reminiscences and autobiography it makes rather jumpy reading. The second part is about the Song School since its foundation in 1932, ending in an appeal for its financial support. If the appeal for so worthy a cause is the main object of writing the book, this second part would appear to be too short. One would like to know more about the life of the School.

The book is written in a journalistic style and leaves the reader with a multitude of impressions. Occasionally there are irritating notes, such as "gentle reader" and "the Sanctissimum" for the Reserved Sacrament, and perhaps a little too much personal reminiscence. Nevertheless one is left with great admiration for the vision of the School conceived in Somers Town and the continued battle to realize and maintain it. The author is probably right when he claims that more vocations to the priesthood come from this type of school than any other.

Northolt Park. I. R. Carrick, O.G.S.

Christianity Past and Present. By Basil Willey. C.U.P. 10s. 6d.

The Principles and Practice of the Christian Faith. By W. Norman Pittenger. S.C.M. Press. 9s. 6d.

The Psychology of Unbelief. By H. C. Rümke. Rockliff. 7s. 6d.

Each of these books is an attempt in its own way to discuss the presentation of Christianity to non-Christians. Prof. Willey's book, which has had some acclamation, is in my view to be commended above all for its tone of voice. In his survey of "Christianity Past" he takes us on a jet-plane to tour through history, from the wisdom of Greece, via the Middle Ages to Deism, and so to Darwin, Huxley, and the Rationalists: nothing very new here, though skilfully piloted. But clearly the destination is "Christianity Present": what can we still believe, what dare we off-load? Here I find Prof. Willey more convincing when he pulls Christians by the sleeve or asks questions politely from the front row, than when he comes on the stage and seconds the vote of thanks to the Christian speakers. He is very confident that we have all rediscovered the Christian doctrine of Original Sin, and that this disposes for good of liberal utopianism; he thinks that the contest, Science *v.* Religion, is over; he is sure that we all "must have a religion", and takes it for granted that the great Christian apologists of our generation have in the main made out their case. With this assumption safely behind him, he can go on

to raise serious doubts whether the details of the apologists' case (e.g. the bodily Resurrection, the Virgin Birth) have been or can be made out. This he does with the utmost diffidence and good taste. But what I fear is whether the assumption itself is so reliable: whether the Christian apologist can sail so happily to victory upon the wave of man's newly discovered imperfectibility: and whether Prof. Willey has taken sufficient account of the opponent who gives a psychological explanation of both man's guilt-sense and his "need for religion". It is witty, but does not reach the profoundest problem, merely to say that "Instead of saying 'We have offended against thy holy laws', we now say, 'Dear me, how very unwise my parents must have been when I was an infant' " (p. 8).

Dr Pittenger's book does not reach any profound problems at all. It is a clear, and in a short space a thorough, exposition of that Catholic faith and life with which I should identify myself: but it seems to me singularly "inactuel". Prof. Clement Webb will be startled to find himself described therein as "one of the greatest of contemporary philosophers". The book is written for "the younger generation"—students and graduates; it looks as if the American students in view have not caught up with the discussions an apologist over here has to engage in.

For this reason it is Dr Rümke's little book that is the nearest to an apologetic for *To-day*. Aware that psychologists have played the happy game of psychologizing religious faith out of existence, he psychologizes unbelief. And within the compass of a very short book he does it very well. He accepts—and I think he is right to accept—the Freudian account of the growth of conscience (Super-Ego formation); but assumes, again quite rightly, that this is not at all to explain conscience away but to relate it to the process of psychological evolution. Indeed, his book is largely an account of the seven stages of psychic growth by which the individual becomes adjusted to society, himself and "the primary cause" (God); and in terms of these stages shows what goes wrong, usually round about the fourth or fifth stages, when the individual develops, not towards faith but towards its rejection. "I am convinced that he who describes man as *homo religiosus* keeps more strictly to observed facts, and is therefore more scientific, than he who interprets these facts as symptoms of secondary importance." Among the factors influencing man against religious surrender (most of them narcissistic) are "fear of passivity", showing itself in man's restlessness, "aversion to effeminacy" (probably originating in the Oedipus complex), etc. Obviously there are important theological questions raised here (especially in the realm of "natural theology") which there is no space to discuss. And no doubt the psychologists themselves will question some of Dr Rümke's statements—especially as the book is unfortunately much too short to be anything but an appetizer. But its importance lies in the fact that the author is a practising analyst, who refers constantly to the evidence of his own consulting-room—would he had done so in more detail!—and that his discussion arises directly out of the empirical situation. His claims for religion are the more compelling for

their very modesty. I hope he will now give us the big book we need on this most crucial of topics.

MIRFIELD. MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, C.R.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF MAIN STREET. By Theodore O. Wedel. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

ONE MAN'S MIND. By John Rowland. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

The Christianity of Main Street is Christianity in which Christ is omitted and the example of the historical Jesus and his ideals substituted, a humanist Christianity in which theology has been jettisoned as unnecessary baggage. The danger of it is that it ends in an idolatry of ideals, in radical secularism, or in the despair which is the inevitable result of a grace-less attempt at the imitation of Christ. The only hope for Christianity lies in a return to "classical Christianity", based on the Bible and the Creeds and involving essentially membership of the Church. This is Dr Wedel's thesis. The first part of the book gives a fair and appreciative account of humanist Christianity, the second a persuasive though too short account of classical Christianity. The Creeds are presented in terms of drama, in which God is the chief actor. They have only one technical term, "of one substance", otherwise they are verb-creeds, "basically a simple story-creed, not a scheme of divinity". The definiteness of a dogmatic Christianity is shown to be essential to achieve the aim of Christian faith, the true imitation of Christ as Lord and Saviour. The author draws a necessary distinction between story-theology and notion-theologies as seen, for example, in the Creeds and "Confessions" of various churches. The book is attractively written and deserves to be read and well digested by all who have the responsibility of teaching the faith, and particularly by those who still feel that the way to attract people to the practice of Christianity is to minimize the doctrinal content of the faith. For though the author is concerned with the American scene—he is a Canon of Washington Cathedral and Warden of the College of Preachers—his book applies even more forcibly to the English Main Street.

Mr Rowland has written a spiritual autobiography describing his pilgrimage from rationalism to the Christian faith. A latent scepticism of boyhood, strengthened by the seeming certitude of science, became explicit at college. It was as a result of the influence of literature rather than of people that he came to put his trust in the dogmas of evolution and the inevitability of man's progress to an earthly utopia, under the guidance of science. There followed a long association with the Rationalist Press Association, combined with other literary activity. It was the tension between the artist and the scientist in him which began the conflict of ideas that gradually increased and was only finally resolved in the acceptance of Christianity. A growing appreciation of the need for some measure of mysticism led to his first departure from strictly orthodox rationalism. Dissatisfaction increased, through a realization of the danger of the enthronement of man in the place of God, with the paradox in totalitarianism of

the resulting destruction of the dignity of the individual human personality. The brotherhood of all men could be realized only in a Christian world through the fatherhood of God. It was a recognition that there was something wrong in the heart of man, together with wider reading, of theology as well as other subjects, and the reconciling thereby of the apparently conflicting claims of science and religion, which finally helped to bring Mr Rowland into the fellowship of Christianity. This is an extremely interesting account of an independently minded rationalist's reactions to ideas, rather than to people. It should be of use particularly to those who have contact with anyone who finds in science the answer to all our problems.

THORPE BAY. DENIS A. J. IRELAND.

THE MYSTICS OF SPAIN. (Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West, No. 5.) By E. Allison Peers. Allen and Unwin. 9s. 6d.

It is much to be hoped that anthologies of the mystics will not bear the same relation to a decline in mystical religion as anthologies of the Bible have borne in days not quite gone by to the decline in biblical Christianity. The idea behind the present series of Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West is a dubious one, and seems calculated to produce little more than the polished eclecticism which will accept the more lofty and attractive tenets of any religion so long as it remains totally committed to none.

All the more pity in view of the calibre of the contribution under review. The extracts are well and widely chosen; the bibliographies full and valuable; the introduction illuminating; the translation pleasing; and the production attractive. It deserves to achieve its aim of leading readers to the complete works. J. K. B.

ST BERNARD ON THE SONG OF SONGS. Translated and Edited by a Religious of C.S.M.V. Mowbrays. 12s. 6d.

St Bernard is brought a good deal nearer by this able digest of his greatest sermons. His sermons on the Seasons would make a useful Christmas present for 1953. J. K. B.

We have received the following letter from Mr Patrick Radcliffe, 20, Plantation Road, Oxford:

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May I offer some comments on the review by Père Bouyer, in the August number of THEOLOGY, of *The New Eve*, which I edited, and try to correct some false impressions which might arise from the review?

In the first place the book is a collection of the principal writings of Cardinal Newman on Our Lady. For some reason Père Bouyer fails to mention this. The object of publishing the book was to produce a really good, cheap book about Our Lady, and Newman's writings seemed an obvious choice. There was no question of trying to deceive the public into thinking that this was hitherto unpublished Newman material. But because this was the first time that the

material had been published together, some title had to be found; *The New Eve* was chosen as summing up Newman's approach to the theology of Our Lady. It is difficult to see why Père Bouyer judges that it would be "utterly repulsive" to Newman.

Secondly, Père Bouyer says I admit that I have not scrupled to rewrite "whole paragraphs" of the compilation. Presumably he refers to the passages which Newman quotes from the Fathers, and which I have given in a new translation. I gave the reason for this in the Introduction. Newman himself says in a footnote to these passages in the early editions: "I have attempted to translate literally without caring to write English" (*Difficulties of Anglicans*, Vol. II, p. 33), and he had the original passages printed at the end of the book. Few of our readers to-day would have profited by the Latin and Greek texts, so these were omitted; but Newman's translation by itself, on account of its literalness, its following of classical constructions, and its use of words now no longer current, would also be obscure to many. As the book was intended for a wide public the only way out was to provide a more colloquial translation. Père Bouyer's implication that I have recast whole paragraphs of Newman's own writing is both inaccurate and unjust.

Finally, Père Bouyer adds, I apologize that "the poor old great man with all this brushing up still makes a rather poor figure to the modern and enlightened reader, and politely washes his hands for that." I can only imagine that Père Bouyer has read the Introduction hurriedly and misunderstood it, for in fact I said precisely the opposite. Most people would agree that Newman, for all the beauty of his style, is not light reading. None the less, it is not we who are "enlightened" if we fail to grasp his meaning because we are put off by surface difficulties. And it is true of Newman, more than of most writers, that the more one reads the more meaning one discovers. It was to try and ensure that some readers would not be put off from the start by Newman's style that I added to the Introduction that last note, the meaning of which Père Bouyer has so completely inverted.

Yours sincerely,
PATRICK RADCLIFFE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN PAMPHLETS (6 Fitzroy Square, W.1): *Christian Pamphlets: a select bibliography; List No.* 5 (6d.).

BURNS OATES: Justin McCann (Ed.), *The Rule of St Benedict* (16s.).

DENT: W. H. van de Pol, *The Christian Dilemma* (21s.).

EDITIONS DU CERF: F. Sagnard, O.P. (Ed.), Irénée de Lyon: *Contre les hérésies III* (1,740 fr.).

EPWORTH PRESS: S. R. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic* (22s. 6d.).

KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): A. de Quervain, *Mensch und Staat heute* (M. 2.45); Fritz Lieb, *Wir Christen und der Kommunismus* (M. 1.70).

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION: *Marriage and Divorce in the Church of England* (2s.).

MOWBRAY: R. R. Williams, *The Perfect Law of Liberty: an interpretation of Psalm* 119 (3s. 6d.); Percy Hartill, *The Unity of God* (16s.).

NISBET: Stephen Neill, *The Christian Society* (17s. 6d.).

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS: Π. Ν. Τρεμπελα, *Ὁμιλητική ἤ ἱστορία καὶ Θεωρία τοῦ κηρύγματος*; Π. Ι. Μπρατσιωτης, *Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής*; Β. Βέλλας. *Ἐκλεκτοὶ Ψαλμοί.*

S.P.C.K. (FOR CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): C. J Stranks, *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (25s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher